

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In response to the last Office Action (March 10, 2005) as to the failure to claim the subject matter and for being incomplete and omitting essential elements, I have amended the claims to be more detailed and submitted new art work.

In reviewing *Sowrys*' patent I was able to discern a tremendous difference between what *Sowry*'s invention and mine in both form and function. *Sowry* invented an apparatus he describes as a grip, that can be placed over the handle of an existing tool rendering it buoyant. He explicitly states that he does not want to change the characteristics of a tool, thus making that tool weaker. This grip is designed to fit over that tool to enable it to be buoyant. You can see if this grip were not placed over a tool, it in itself would not be a tool and thus have no function as a tool. It also will not prevent said tool from corroding.

My invention is a tool, in and of itself. My main concern was buoyancy, reflectivity and corrosion resistance. The entire tool is buoyant. It will be a weaker tool than one made of steel. But it will not corrode. My tool is a wrench. It can unscrew bolts.

In my multi-tool design it can screw in screws, do light hammering and with a marlinspike splice rope.

CONCLUSION

Having reviewed the Office Action (March 10, 2005) I hope that my Amendments and Drawings will help you discern my invention from any other invention. Also, I hope that you can see that my invention is a tool and *Sowrys'* invention is a tool attachment.

The examiner is invited to contact me to discuss any matters pertaining to this present application. If there are any resubmitting fees please let me know and I will forward you a check.

Sincerely,

Bradley Birns

Submitted by: _____
Bradley Birns
2825 Morning Glory Lane
Davie, Florida 33328
Tel.: (954) 424-1256